

I had the opportunity to know. I just met with a number of them last week out in the western part of the State. They do a great job, but they need more resources, especially in an economy that is so competitive for workforce and so competitive in areas like rent and housing and the cost of living.

So by allowing the local offices to keep more of the permitting fees, we can channel the resources to allow them to do their jobs better and faster, without compromising the integrity of their charge to protect our other natural resources above the ground. They do it as well as anybody, and we ought to let them do that job and empower them to do it.

H.R. 2728, the Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act, simply acknowledges what the Constitution guarantees, and that is that we are a Nation of States and that States are, in fact, sovereign, and that nobody is more protective of the land and the water and the air than the people who live on it and drink it and breathe it. It simply states that if you have fracturing rules in your State, that is good enough. It is your State, and the Federal Government's minimum standards ought not impose, be an imposition, on the States and their rights to develop their resources the way they want to. It frees up resources of the Federal Government, while unleashing the ingenuity and innovation of our energy economy, providing wealth, providing jobs, and, by the way, reducing the cost of energy for the rest of us, which makes us even more competitive in the global marketplace.

We have a grand opportunity today, Mr. Speaker, to pass these two bills and to put America on a path to full economic recovery and, perhaps, to bring more troops home from the Middle East to reduce our dependency on foreign oil. Let's do this not only as a country, but as a continent, acknowledging that our friends in Canada are better trading partners than Venezuela. Let's build the pipelines and infrastructure necessary. Let's unleash American ingenuity, and let's put America back to work by becoming more energy secure.

IMPACTS OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share some of the stories that fellow Californians in my district are having with the impact under the ACA, the ObamaCare plan.

A funny thing happened on the way to government-run health care nirvana. 1.1 million Californians have lost their health care coverage. In fact, for every one person who has selected a new ACA ObamaCare plan, 40 people have received cancellation notices.

They find that their costs are going to increase, especially in rural California, where choices are more limited of plans, of places to seek health care. Their access to health care is being jeopardized. The law is creating a huge burden for rural health care, where, again, you have to travel maybe several hours, many miles, to seek the kind of health care you need.

Despite the President's promise to the public on this issue, "If you like your plan, you can keep it. Period," we heard; "If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Period," we heard, this is clearly not the case. Less access, fewer choices, skyrocketing premiums, it is the wrong direction from the President's health care plan as promised.

I would like to share, again, some of the people from our district.

Bill and Corina Eiler from Fort Jones, California, they write, I received a letter from Anthem Blue Cross notifying me that, due to the Affordable Care Act, my plan had been canceled. My new monthly premium of \$919, it used to be \$480 a month, a 192 percent increase, which Bill finds absurd. They have two daughters in college and one more at home. How are they supposed to come up with that kind of money?

Tricia Plass of Tulelake writes that she and her husband, they are business owners. They are self-employed. They have always purchased their own health insurance. Their monthly premium has been around \$800 a month for both of them. Their monthly premium will now jump to over \$1,000 for just one of them. They still have to determine what the other one is going to do. It now appears they will be forced into California's insurance coverage, known as Covered California, where there are no plans with coverage for their doctor that they use now. Since they live near the State line of Oregon, they get their health care on the other side in Oregon. Their facility is there. Their doctor is there. They will no longer be able to see that doctor. They are going to have to drive maybe 2 or 3 hours to Redding or somewhere else to find new physicians. So they live with the constant fear that their new policy will not even provide coverage when they need it.

Janice Marquis from Redding writes:

I recently received a letter from Aetna stating that my medical care coverage policy would be canceled at the end of the year.

She is 62 and must wait 2½ years before she is eligible for Medicare. Her insurance coverage will jump from \$318 a month to over \$500 a month. The promise made by President Obama, "if you like your policy, you can keep it," she feels, was a lie.

This entire program is a nightmare.

Lastly, this one is really disturbing. A lady named Ramona Larramendy from Redding, California, says she was diagnosed with stage 3 ovarian cancer in July. With her current plan she was able to get the surgery and treatment she needed. A very large hospital bill of

\$128,000 was covered. Her insurance paid all but \$700 of that because she had good coverage. Now, because she is going to be canceled, she doesn't know what is going to happen to her. She still needs a lot more treatment in this crisis moment of her life, and yet, for her Christmas present, she is going to get uncertainty. She is going to get the worry, at a time where she is being treated for stage 3 cancer, what is the health care plan that, for political purposes, it appears, since we have done everything else to try and point out to the American people and to the politicians in this building that it needs to be fixed or changed, that we are not getting it right here.

So what are we going to do? Again, these Californians are not alone. These Americans are not alone. Millions are paying the price for the President's broken promises.

It should not be a political issue. It should be us serving the public. We cannot continue to stand by and watch as millions are losing their coverage that they want, that they shopped for, that they were diligent about, with people that are professionals that know what they are doing, unlike what we see with the people running the Web sites, which is only a small part of the whole big picture of what is wrong with this system.

We need to set the egos aside, go back to the drawing board—at the very least, set this aside for a year. I believe we should repeal it and go back to targeting the people that really do need the help and let the folks in this country that are already reasonably happy with their plan, have done the diligence, have made the efforts to get the coverage and be responsible Americans, they don't need to be bothered in this scenario. Let's help the people that need the help. The American Health Care Reform Act, as put over by the Republican Study Committee, is one way to do that.

So let's look for alternatives. We have alternatives. We have had them all along, as Republicans, as conservatives, as people that understand business. And so let's make these choices available to the American public, not force them into something that they never asked for other than for political purposes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 8 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM) at noon.